

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 and 107-110 have been canceled. Claims 36-106 are now pending in the application, of which claims 44-100 and 102-106 have been withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 36, 41-43, and 101 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,875,231 to Farfan et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,488,004 to Bogart et al.; claim 37 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farfan et al. in view of Bogart et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,577,111 to Iida et al.; and claims 38-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farfan et al. in view of Bogart et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,692,033 to Farris. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

The Examiner conceded that Farfan et al. failed to disclose:

"when a call from a first telephony device connected with a first private branch exchange to a second telephony device connected with a second private branch exchange through a public telephone network cannot be connected due to the second telephony device being busy; and executing a camp-on control between the second telephony device and the first telephony device by controlling the second private branch exchange using the received control request information." Page 3, line 21 to page 4, lines 2 of the Office Action.

The Examiner, thus, relied upon Bogart et al. as a new combining reference that allegedly suggests these features. But Bogart et al. only describe a tie-trunk connecting PBXs:

"Referring to FIG. 1, a schematic diagram of a portion of an improved corporate switching network is shown as comprising three PBXs, -A, -D and -E. Each PBX in the network has a respective switch processor 201CC for administering an associated switch and its interPBX tie-trunks TT-. In addition, the switch processor is connected by a link 5 to a data link control unit DMDC which provides packet switching access to a group of packet switching data links DDL- which interconnect all of the PBXs (-A, -D and -E). The DMDC operates like a packet switch

and supports virtual call circuits among the PBX's via the links. The data link control (DMDC-A) of PBX-A also has data link access by link 1 to an attached peripheral processor CP/A. Applications programs residing in the switch processor of any PBX node may 'talk' to peripheral processor CP/A via packet switching data links DDL- and data link control DMCA-A link 1." Col. 6, lines 13-30 of Bogart et al. (Emphasis added)

From the above, the PBXs are connected together via the interBPX tie-trunk. Each of the PBXs is connected to the switch processor 201CC and the connection between the switch processors is done by the data link DDL.

But as Applicants have pointed out with previously-cited references, Bogart et al. still only describe a tie-trunk—and not a public telephone network—being used as the connection line to connect the PBXs, and still fail to disclose or suggest the claimed features in connection with PBXs being connected through a public telephone network:

"A trunk that directly interconnects, or ties together, two PBXs in a private network configuration, a tie trunk is a dedicated circuit that generally is leased from a public carrier: Through the use of optional automatic route selection (ARS) software, PBX systems can automatically route calls between offices over an available *tie trunk rather than over the public switched telephone network (PSTN)*, thereby avoiding toll charges."

- <http://computer.yourdictionary.com/tie-trunk>
(Emphasis added)

Thus, Bogart et al., as cited and relied upon by the Examiner—and correspondingly, the proposed combination of references—fail to disclose or suggest computer telephony integration control request information and camp-on control features for a call between a first telephony device and a second telephony device through a public telephone network.

Thus, even assuming, arguendo, that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to combine Farfan et al. and Bogart et al., such a combination would still have failed to disclose or suggest,

"[a] computer telephony integration client unit for transmitting computer telephony integration control request information for use in requesting computer telephony integration control to a computer telephony integration server unit, comprising:

a computer telephony integration control request information editing unit that edits the computer telephony integration control request information when a call from **a first telephony device** connected with a first private branch exchange to **a second telephony device** connected with a second private branch exchange **through a public telephone network** cannot be connected due to the second telephony device being busy; and

a communications control unit that communicates with the computer telephony integration server unit through a computer network the computer telephony integration control request information and information relating to the computer telephony integration control request information so that the computer telephony integration server unit executes a camp-on control between the second telephony device and the first telephony device by controlling the second private branch exchange using the received computer telephony integration control request information," as recited in claim 36. (Emphasis added)

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 36, together with claims 41-43 dependent therefrom, is patentable over Farfan et al. and Bogart et al., separately and in combination, for at least the above-stated reasons. Claim 101 incorporates features that correspond to those of claim 36 cited above, and is, therefore, patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons.

The Examiner cited Iida et al. and Farris as combining references to respectively address the additional features recited in claims 37-40, which depend from claim 36. As such, combinations with these references would still have failed to cure the above-described deficiencies of Farfan et al. and Bogart et al. in connection with claim 36. And thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 37-40, dependent from claim 36, are patentable over the cited references for at least the above-stated reasons.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,

/Dexter T. Chang/

Dexter T. Chang

Reg. No. 44,071

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304

Telephone: (212) 940-6384

Fax: (212) 940-8986 or 8987

Docket No.: 100794-00578 (FUJO 14.947A)

DTC:fd